Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	11/239,046	ASCHARLKAMRANI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Abdulhakim Nobahar	2132
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT	O personnel):	
(1) Abdulhakim Nobahar.	(3) Ms. Shawna Shaw, Applicants' agent.	
(2) Mr. Teghi Arani, Primary examiner.	(4)Mr. Nader Asghari-	Kemrani, Applicant
Date of Interview: 25 April 2007.		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal (copy given to: 1)☒ applicant	2) applicant's represent	ative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes if Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.	
Claim(s) discussed: 3.		
Identification of prior art discussed: 6,529,885.81.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g) was not reached. h)	□ N/A.
Substance of interview including description of the gene reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Street</u>	ral nature of what was agree	ed to if an agreement was
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ame allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attact	copy of the amendments ti	r agreed would render the claims nat would render the claims
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to I griven A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONG INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS IN FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW DATE.	he last Office action has alre R OF ONE MONTH OR TH NTERVIEW SUMMARY FOI	eady been filed, APPLICANT IS IRTY DAYS FROM THIS RM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
		á
	S	JL .
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's	Polov signature, if required

PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Paper No. Applica20070426

Application No. 09/940,635

Continuation of Substance of Interview Including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant, mr. Asginat-Kannrari, proposed a new set of amended claims and pointed out that the newly amended independent claims 15-17 do not contain new motiters and each of them notite limitations that are combination of limitations of a previously presented independent claim plus the imitations of two dependent claims. Furthermore, applicant explained mate teach newly amended independent claim contains a limitation of that recites "wherein the financial institution is a bank" that the prior art Berg (2002/0188481 A1) rices not lisach.

Examiner, Nobahar, referred applicants to the paragraph (0006) of Berg, where it recites "The JV Authority can be a business information provider, such as, a provider of business, financial and/or quality assurance information, and/or a joint venture between an insurance underwriter and a business information provider. The business information provider can be, for example, Dun & Bradstreet."

Applicant disagreed and asserted that the type of joint venture mentioned in prior art Berg is different from a bank recited by the independent claims of his invention. Thus, the prior art Berg fails to read on the above-mentioned limitation of the amended independent claims.

Examiner Nobeltur agreed with the applicant assertion and also agreed to consider the newly amended claims for examination after applicant files them as new amendment officially.

PAGE 5/5 * RCVD AT 4/27/2007 1:32:26 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-2/6 * DNIS:2733808 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):01-40